

# SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. IX, No. 5

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

March 15, 1979

## OMB Issues Academic R&D Cost Regulations

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) came through this month with its promise to change the way universities figure the costs of conducting federally sponsored research. And while some campus administrators are still perturbed that many of the changes will be costly for their institutions, most agree that the new accounting procedures are not as bad as they might have been.

In fact, it was a rare round of applause for government cooperation and understanding that was echoing from the campuses last week when officials heard OMB's final word on the new accounting procedures. University administrators have their gripes about the final version of Circular A-21, which appeared in the March 6 *Federal Register*. Yet many campus officials are now praising OMB for its willingness to listen to university concerns and its attempt to hammer out a set of cost-accounting principles that at least makes some compromises between the universities' desires for flexibility and the government's need for accountability.

Accountability is, of course, nothing new to the

tenance and building depreciation.

By the end of last summer, the National Association of College and University Business Officers had predicted that the proposed system would cost universities at least \$100 million a year in lost revenue from the government.

Officials from the business association now say they do not know—nor do they intend to find out—how much it will actually cost the universities to implement the final requirements, which are scheduled to go into effect Oct. 1.

As much as it may hurt, says Milton Goldberg, an official at the business officers' association, it is now time to stop bickering about costs and to start thinking about "implementation."

Seminars on just that subject will be sponsored by the association in cities around the country in the weeks ahead.

The fact that they are already booked comes as little surprise to those who have already studied the regulations.

Indeed, most university officials agree that new rules will be difficult to get into place in such a short time, if not impossible to administer in the long run.

*(Continued On Page 2)*

## IRS Relaxes Stand On Tax-Exempt Status---Page 6

major research centers. Bookkeeping requirements have been in place for decades and revised ones have been under discussion for nearly four years.

It was in 1975, following Congressional criticism that research costs on campuses had gone out of control, that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare sent proposals to OMB for revising the standards used to determine research charges.

The changes were aimed at the way universities figure the "direct" costs of sponsored research, i.e., those usually associated with paying salaries and purchasing materials. The rules would have also governed the "indirect" costs of conducting that research, including such items as utilities, janitorial services, and overall university administration.

Because of controversies over their impact, the rules were altered twice in 1977 and again in March, 1978. The March draft underwent particularly strenuous criticism by officials at many leading universities who said that the new rules, in effect, would have curbed the use of students as research assistants and reduced the amount that could be charged for library main-

## In Brief

**Handler's Statue of Limitations:** Academy President Philip Handler has consented to a minor change in that broodingnagian statue of Einstein that's he's having erected on the Academy's lawn: The original plans had Einstein gazing at a star map depicting the constellations at the moment of his birth. Informed that that smacks of astrology, Handler agreed to a change that would depict the constellations at the moment of dedication.

*SGR is informed by its "mole" at the NAS that Handler is a Leo.*

While still legislatively gestating, that R&D foundation for foreign aid that President Carter proposed last year has undergone a name change. Originally called the Foundation for International Technological Cooperation, it's been rechristened the Institute for Technological Cooperation, to be known as IFTC, to avoid confusion with the International Trade Commission. SGR heard the name change explained but didn't understand it.

## ... Business Managers Say It's Tolerable

(Continued From Page 1)

Some officials say, for example, that the new rules will require a substantial number of the nation's universities to overhaul their entire accounting systems. For many, that will mean changing already complex computer programs. And for some, it could mean major dislocations in funding.

For example, officials from several campuses predict that new formulas for figuring the direct costs of research may shift an unnecessarily large amount of money to researchers who have expensive laboratories, while drastically reducing the proportion of support that goes to researchers whose major expenses are salaries.

Even those officials who don't have to change their entire accounting systems worry that they will be forced to alter their payroll systems to account in detail for the way researchers spend their time.

And that is not an easy thing to do, contends Stanford's Assistant Comptroller Frank Riddle.

Riddle likes to use the example of the university doctor who, with a student at his side, examines a special research patient in a teaching hospital. How, Riddle wonders, should the doctor's salary costs be accounted for. Is he teaching? Is he doing research? Is he treating a patient?

Some campus administrators, including those at MIT, think that it's possible to carry out the provisions without much added expense for the university. But it is also true that some institutions have more sophisticated accounting procedures than others and that the ones that will have to make the most adjustments to the new regulations are the ones that can least afford it.

Stanford, which is not as financially strapped as some, says it has added 33 positions in business and finance over the past two years—28 of them working solely on government-sponsored projects.

In other areas, university administrators say the regulations will cheat them out of reimbursements for "real" costs which their institutions incur in the course of carrying out government contracts and grants.

Two such expenses are interest on loans and the

costs of fund raising. Like existing regulations, the new rules will forbid institutions from getting reimbursed for those expenses even when they are directly related to the purchase of equipment or the construction of buildings for government-sponsored projects.

Other accounting procedures, according to the administrators, are unfair to both the government and the institutions because they discourage institutions from entering into "cost-sharing" agreements with a funding agency. By failing to give institutions enough credit for their own support of government-sponsored projects, the regulations are, in effect, stopping institutions from making any financial commitments to the projects, the administrators say.

In spite of all the bad news, there is some very good news in the new rules. Of value to many universities is the fact that OMB will no longer allow individual federal agencies to place arbitrary restrictions on university research—such as, for example, HEW's limit on the percentage of training grants it will support.

But even provisions in the regulations that will be welcome on most campuses have hitches in them that trouble some experts.

One such example is the way the regulations will affect graduate students who participate in the federally supported programs.

Under earlier drafts of the regulations, the government had failed to recognize what the OMB now calls the "dual" role of graduate students as learners and doers in research projects.

The new regulations will allow institutions to collect salaries from the government for graduate students who participate in government-financed projects. What

(Continued on Page 3)

## Sloan Fund Names Head

Albert E. Rees, a Princeton University economist, has been elected president of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, succeeding Nils Y. Wessell, who has held the post since 1968. The foundation has recently been distributing about \$15 million a year for research and other activities related to science, technology, economics and management.

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1979

ISSN 0048-9581

Contributing Editor  
**Anne Roark**

Editor and Publisher  
**Daniel S. Greenberg**

European Correspondents  
**Michael Kenward (London)**  
**Francois Segquier (Paris)**

Circulation Manager  
**Alice Anne Freund**

Independently published by *Science & Government Report, Inc.*, twice monthly, except once each in January, July and August. Annual Subscription: Institutions, \$84.50 (two years, \$149.50); individuals, \$44 (two years, \$75). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms.

## Britain's Rothschild R&D System---5 Years Later

*London.* It's been five years since the famous Rothschild report led to a substantial revamping of criteria for the British government's support of research and development.

How has it worked out? Not altogether well, it may be concluded from a careful reading of a new White Paper that examines the workings and effects of the Rothschild principles (*Review of the Framework for Government Research and Development*; HMSO, Command 7499, \$2.50).

The aim of the Rothschild report (Command 5046) was to give government departments more control over the research carried out by Britain's research councils (RCs). This was done by taking money from the RCs, which are granting agencies that mainly support academic research, and handing it over to the government's mission-oriented departments. Under Rothschild's "customer/contractor" concept, the intent was that the departments, as customers, would commission research through the RCs. The object was to make the RCs more responsive to the country's economic needs. Naturally enough the scheme was not well received in the research community, which objected, among other things, to what it saw as a loss of independence from government interference.

This objection, it is now clear, missed the point. The changes were made during one of those periodic bouts of doubt about the direction in which the nation was going. It was argued that since innovation is the lifeblood of Britain, and innovation stems from research,

researchers should acknowledge the nation's needs, rather than continuing with work that interested no one outside the scientific community. Rothschild and his supporters stressed that the government's ministries are the custodians of the nation's wellbeing, and, therefore, should have some control over the research that is supposed to improve the national lot.

The new White Paper admits, however, that things haven't gone perfectly. One of the major problems is that the five years since the implementation of the customer/contractor principle have been bad years for the economy. And from time to time the ministries decided that there were more pressing calls on their cash than research. The five-year review coyly states that for the Agricultural, Environmental and Medical Councils, "some certainty of funding is essential."

This argument has already had some effect. The increase in R&D funds announced by the government toward the end of last year owes much to the realization that the RCs had been neglected a bit too much.

Another deleterious impact of the customer/contractor relationship has been a reduction in the freedom of the RCs to pursue long-term ideas that they consider worthwhile. With something like 80 per cent of the Agricultural Research Council's researchers engaged at least partly in commissioned research—more than half the ARC's R&D is commissioned by outside customers—this council finds it very difficult "to rede-

*(Continued On Page 4)*

### OMB

*(Continued From Page 2)*

the regulations will not allow, according to the universities, is adequate accounting of many of the students' indirect expenses, including the use of the various services provided for them on campus.

Perhaps the most costly provision of all is one forbidding universities to include in their indirect-cost estimates the expenses involved in university "tuition-remission" programs for graduate researchers.

By having their tuition reduced or eliminated, campus officials reason, the students are being paid salaries for their work. But the government regulations, the officials contend, do not automatically recognize that fact.

That single provision in the regulation could cost some institutions as much as \$1 million a year, officials estimate.

Institutions will be allowed to get around that restriction, as well as other controversial requirements in the regulations, simply by conducting special in-

stitutional surveys showing that their own accounting procedures make more sense in their particular circumstances.

Most campus officials agree that such flexibility is the only real saving grace in the regulations. Others argue, however, that even that could turn out to be a mixed blessing.

In fact, some campus officials say that too much flexibility in the rules will simply create more disputes than ever between federal agencies and academic institutions.

"I wouldn't be surprised," says one campus administrator, "to see a whole rash of audit disputes break out in the year ahead."

"And the awful thing," he says, "is that what they are disputing about really doesn't matter all that much. In the end, institutions aren't going to get any more or any less money from the government for their research projects. The regulations are only going to see that the money is distributed a little bit differently."—Anne Roark (The author is an assistant editor of *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.)

## OTA Board Wants to Move Fast in Picking New Director

The Congressional Board of the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) met on March 8 and decided that the search for a replacement for the newly resigned Director Russell W. Peterson should be brief, rather than of the marathon variety that culminated in Peterson's hiring.

Just how brief was not decided, but the members asked Board Chairman Rep. Morris Udall (D-Ariz.) and Vice Chairman Senator Ted Stevens (R-Alaska) to come up with a recommendation within a month. What is not desired, it was made clear, is a re-run of the last selection process, which—for the purpose of proving that OTA was free of any Kennedy political germs—was a painfully prolonged business. Hundreds of names were collected and studied, the records of many were sifted by the Civil Service Commission, though it has no authority whatever over OTA, and finalists were tediously interviewed by the board.

The intent was to counter right-wing frothings about Kennedy's designs on OTA's staff payroll, which, it was alleged, he was surreptitiously using to

further devious presidential aspirations.

When all the names had been examined, however, the Board remained cool to anyone who was willing to accept the job. Finally, someone thought of a candidate who had not been swept up in the hunt—Russell W. Peterson, who, among other charms, was a Republican, a former member of the Council on Environmental Quality, and available.

However, 13 months, and many declamations on his favorite subject—"holism"—later, Peterson announced that he's off to take the presidency of the National Audubon Society (SGR Vol. IX, No. 4). And that accounts for the need for a new chief for the much-troubled OTA.

Meanwhile, there's been a minor shift of positions on OTA's Technology Assessment Advisory Council: Frederick Robbins, dean of Case Western Reserve Medical School, has moved from vice chairman to chairman of the Council, and MIT President Jerome Wiesner, who held the chairmanship since 1976, has shifted to vice chairman.

## ... Longterm Research Feels Money Pinch

*(Continued From Page 3)*

ploy staff for new or adjusted programs on non-commissioned work." In other words, give the ministries too much power and the RCs have to spend so much time on R&D that the departments consider important that they have no freedom to pursue exciting new ideas as they come along.

Some government departments have taken time to learn what science and scientists are. This has had both good and bad effects on the Medical Research Council, for example. The MRC has become involved in far more bureaucracy than before—something that all the RCs complain about—but because the MRC has had to teach the Department of Health and Social Security (DHSS), its major customer, what research is, the scientists have, after a battle, been able to convince the ministry that their research is significant and just what the DHSS needs. As a result the MRC's research program has seen little change over the past five years.

However, relations between the DHSS and the MRC became so strained at one stage, thanks partly to unexpected budget cutting by the DHSS, that they had to reorganize their administrative arrangements to reduce the friction. The White paper merely mentions this, saying that the new setup allows the Health Department "to indicate to the Council the range of health topics to which they would wish to see biomedical research applied. This offers the basis on which the

Council is able to show how their research program reflects these needs." It seems strange that they are still talking in these terms five years after the implementation of a system that was supposed to achieve that very same thing.

One outcome of the new arrangement has been to bring home to the ministries that R&D exists. Of course, all had, to a certain extent, spent money on research—partly with their own research institutions, and partly in industry—but this was mostly at the development end of the R&D spectrum. Now the departments have to pay more attention to the research side of things. To do this, after the acceptance of the Rothschild recommendations, most government departments created the post of departmental chief scientist. Not only has this given them someone to keep tabs on commissioned research, it has also given the ministries a source of scientific advice for their other activities. And there are even signs that some departments—the Department of Industry, for example, which has led the way in funding just about any suggestion for work in the microelectronics area—have benefitted from having a chief scientist.

The Rothschild plan also increased the ministries' power over the RCs by giving them a member on each council whose work is relevant to their department—this is usually the departmental chief scientist.

*(Continued On Page 5)*



## ... Government's Scientists Won't Move

(Continued From Page 4)

The chief scientists also sit on the Advisory Board for the Research Councils (ABRC)—yet another layer of bureaucracy created by the earlier White Paper.

One of the major tasks of the ABRC has been to advise the government on how the research cake should be shared. Thus the ABRC has, at times, been the scene of bitter fights as the Science Research Council, which was hardly affected by the customer/contractor principle, fought to fend off those who would cut back on its high-energy physics and big science in favor of more "relevant" research.

The new White Paper says the ABRC should now begin to spend a bit more time on "the consideration of general problems covering a wide area which concern both the scientific community and the Government."

The original White Paper also set out to do something about the position of scientists in government. It came up with suggestions that were supposed to make scientific civil servants—the bulk of British scientists work for the government or for semi-governmental organizations such as the UK Atomic Energy Authority—feel a part of the greater civil service community.

There were schemes whereby especially good scientific civil servants would be able to make the transition to the more bureaucratic grades. The government was surprised when scientists showed almost no enthusiasm for such schemes as SPATS (the Senior Professional

Administrative Trainee Scheme). In 1972 a princely 24 scientists enrolled into SPATS, and by 1978 the number had dropped to a derisory four. None of the other schemes had any greater success and the new White Paper suggests that someone has seen the light. "Some evidence now suggests," it says, "that the personal priorities of scientists may be different from those of administrators and this may account for their low numbers" in the administrative civil service. (Oddly enough the various ministries still seem to prefer to populate their administrative grades with economists and graduates in esoteric subjects or dead languages rather than scientists, even when the jobs have a significant technical content.)

The realization that scientists aren't like ordinary people hasn't stopped the government from persisting in its belief that researchers should be press-ganged, albeit subtly, into the civil service. (Perhaps this is because the people who drafted the White Paper cannot believe that everyone does not want to be like them.)

The review of R&D says there will be yet another "wide ranging review of the recruitment, structure and management of Scientific Civil Service." The idea is that the government will ensure "that we have the staff of quality and experience needed to undertake the full range of work expected of scientists now and in the future."

The problem is that, partly because scientists don't

(Continued On Page 6)

## AAAS to Decide Soon on Publication of a New Magazine

That new bi-monthly, general science magazine that's under consideration at the American Association for the Advancement of Science is due for a go or no-go decision at the April 20-21 meeting of the AAAS Board (SGR Vol. IX, No. 1).

Returns from promotional test mailings are now being evaluated, and, according to Allen L. Hammond, who's heading the project, they're looking good. Hammond, who formerly edited *Science's* Research News section, says that *Science Today* has almost finally been selected as the title for the magazine.

What's still causing nervous twitching at the AAAS is the simultaneous march of Time Inc. into the science periodical field. The big publishing conglomerate is said to be close to completion of a prototype issue of a magazine that sounds not altogether different from what the AAAS is putting

together. And, though SGR has not been able to sort out who said or did what, if anything at all, it is gossiped in the science-writing fraternity that Time has sought to dissuade the AAAS from plowing on.

Though the AAAS is in relatively good financial shape, it is not in a position to sustain a loser for any lengthy period; Time Inc., however, is.

Meanwhile, there are other stirrings in the science publishing field. Macmillan Journals Ltd., publishers of the venerable *Nature*, has hired Robert Ubell from the editorship of the New York Academy of Sciences monthly *The Sciences* to serve as head of North American operations. Just what this entails isn't clear, nor has the company explained what the relationship will be between London-based *Nature* and its New York-based representative. All that Macmillan has said is that it's looking to expand its American activities.

## Physics Institute Wins Favorable Tax Rule

Scientific and educational organizations may not be in nearly the trouble with federal revenueurs they thought they were only a few months ago.

The national IRS office, which has final say on tax matters, has overturned both local and regional decisions that would have stripped the American Institute of Physics (AIP) of its tax-exempt status.

The difficulty—at least for the rest of the country's scientific societies—is that the national office has not said why it has ruled the way it has.

Following routine tax audits in Washington and New York last year, AIP and a half dozen other scientific associations were told that they were carrying out what local agents considered to be illegal activities for tax-exempt organizations. The challenged activities included such common practices as selling identification badges and providing magazine subscriptions at lower rates to members than to non-members.

Some groups were challenged for publishing journals which IRS officials said were too technical for the general public to enjoy. When such publications do not benefit the general public, IRS reasoned, they were inuring to the benefit of individuals. Such benefits are strictly forbidden under regulations affecting tax-exempt organizations.

The six associations in Washington and New York which were challenged strongly objected to the IRS position, largely because a change in tax-exempt status could mean substantial financial losses for the groups.

In most of the cases, the groups were threatened only with "reclassification" from Section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code as scientific and educational enterprises to Section 501 (c) (6) as business or professional leagues.

### BRITAIN

*(Continued From Page 5)*

want to work in Whitehall, the scientific and administrative sides of the civil service are not comparable. The scientists always seem to get a raw deal, with significantly lower salaries and poorer promotion prospects, than the administrators. This, in turn, makes it difficult for the government to recruit good scientists, even though there are precious few academic posts available. These problems within the scientific civil service led last year to the first strike ever organized by the Institute of Professional Civil Servants at government research establishments (SGR, Vol. VIII, No. 12). That, however, didn't warrant mention in the White Paper, but there is no doubting the impact that manifestation of discontent has had on the government's thinking—though it would never do to admit that strike action pays off.—M.K.

The financial consequences of such a change would mean the loss of a number of local tax and postal privileges. Perhaps most important of all, gifts to them would no longer be tax-deductible for the giver.

In the case of AIP, a local IRS agent had said that the institute should lose its tax-exempt status altogether. Although AIP officials have been reluctant to talk about the matter, they admit that the agent had objected to the "services" the group provides for its member organizations.

Unlike most scientific groups, which have individual members, the physics institute has only group members—nine smaller physics societies.

The society's activities include the publication of journals for member groups, seminars for science writers, and radio programs to inform the public about developments in physics.

Last fall, the North Atlantic regional office of the IRS agreed with the New York district office that such activities were not permissible under the regulations for tax-exempt groups.

What has disturbed tax lawyers for AIP and other scientific groups is that the actions at both the district and regional levels seemed to signal a radical change in the revenue service's policy toward non-profit organizations.

Several months ago an official in the national office conceded that the rulings could well be part of a general "crackdown" on all tax-exempt organizations. In fact, the Washington official, who would not allow himself to be identified publicly, indicated that, since a new office in IRS had been set up for the very purpose, all tax-exempt groups could expect to be brought under greater scrutiny in the future.

On the other hand, even if the organizations are brought under greater scrutiny, some tax lawyers contend that it should not make any significant difference to scientific societies since their main activities are not in violation of IRS codes. The lawyers say they hope that the decisions were simply the work of an "over-zealous" IRS field agent.

That view seemed to be borne out last September

*(Continued On Page 7)*

## Haworth, Ex-NSF Head, Dies

Leland J. Haworth, a major figure in the administration of federal research activities in the postwar period, died March 5 at the age of 74. Haworth was director of the Brookhaven National Laboratory from 1948 to 1961, was subsequently a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, and served as director of the National Science Foundation from 1963 to 1969.

## Decline Continues in Young Faculty Hirings

The proportion of young science and engineering (S&E) faculty members at PhD-granting institutions continued a decade-long decline last year, according to a new study by the National Science Foundation.

With "young" or "recent" defined as within seven years of having received the PhD, the NSF study—based on a survey by the American Council on Education—included the following findings:

- From 1968-78, the total number of full-time S&E doctoral faculty at PhD-granting institutions increased by 14 per cent, but the number of recent doctorates dropped by 39 per cent.

- During that same period, the proportion of recent doctoral faculty in doctoral-level S&E departments dropped from 42 per cent to 24 per cent.

- Applying the often-used standard that calls for recent graduates to make up about three-tenths of the doctoral faculty, the shortfall of youngsters in 1978 was about 2100 out of a total S&E doctoral faculty of 36,000.

- Based on what department chairmen have deemed a desirable age mix, "The greatest disparities are in biochemistry and physics, which have only about one-half the desired percentage of recent doctoral faculty." NSF also reported that "Since 1975, the proportions of recent doctorates have dropped by one-fifth or more in biochemistry, biology, botany, electrical engineering, and physics [faculties]."

- NSF states that the younger faculty members "were experiencing about the same success as their senior colleagues in terms of proposals that had been

### TAX RULING (Continued From Page 6)

when the North Atlantic Regional Office told a smaller physics group—the American Physical Society—that it would keep its tax-exempt status as a scientific and educational organization.

And with the national office ruling the same way on the American Institute of Physics, the coast would seem to be clear for the American Chemical Society, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, the American Society of Civil Engineers, the American Society of Chemical Engineers, and any other groups which are challenged at the local level.

The problem is that it will be a long time—if ever—before IRS will say whether the AIP ruling has anything to do with the other cases.

Although tax decisions are published in various tax journals, decisions affecting tax exemptions often are not published.

"There are so many cases pending already that we do not have time to comment on every one of them," the official said.

The "graying" of American academic science and engineering is another of those topics on which official Washington excels at collecting numbers and engaging in handwringing—but does little or nothing about.

In fact, the anguishing has been accompanied by official assertions that maybe it isn't too bad a problem, after all. Thus, last year's presidential *Science and Technology Report* (SGR Vol. VIII, No. 18) seems to scoff at academe's cries for help, stating that "financial pressures at universities have not yet prevented the addition of professional staff in science and engineering fields. An average growth of 3 per cent has been reported since 1969. The age distribution of scientists and engineers in government and industry are quite similar to those in the universities and colleges, which at least means that no one employment sector is getting a disproportionate share of experienced or inexperienced research personnel."

White House Science Adviser Frank Press and NSF Director Richard Atkinson say the aging is a problem and merits serious concern, but if the feds are stirring on this subject, it's a well-kept secret.

funded," but the survey results don't altogether support that conclusion. Thus, on average, the recent doctorates submitted 20 per cent more proposals than their elders, but their funding record was 55 per cent, compared with 59 per cent for the older applicants.

(Copies of the report may be obtained without charge by requesting publication NSF 79-301 from: NSF, Division of Science Resources Studies, 1800 G St. Nw., Washington, DC 20550.)

### Subscription Form

Science & Government Report  
Northwest Station  
Box 6226A  
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription; ☐ Check enclosed

☐ Enter my subscription; ☐ Please bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, \$75 ☐ ; two years, \$140 ☐

Individual subscribers: one year, \$44 ☐ ; two years, \$75 ☐

(Overseas airmail, \$17.50 per year additional.)

Name

Address

Zip

## News Notes: Women in Science Bill Introduced

Senator Kennedy has reintroduced the Women in Science and Technology Equal Opportunity Act (S. 568), and says he will hold two days of hearings on the bill, sometime in April, with his Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Resources.

The bill would provide assistance for math studies by women at all levels of education, it would provide counseling on educational and career matters, and, in general, would provide encouragement and resources for doing something about the relatively small proportion of women in science and engineering. Kennedy introduced similar legislation last year and held hearings in April.

Additional information about the bill is available from: Anne Strauss, Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Resources, Room 4220, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510.

•  
*Nuclear Waste Disposal*, a two-volume transcript, plus other material, of Senate hearings held last August may be obtained without charge by sending a request and a self-addressed mailing label to: Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space, Room 5202, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510.

•  
*Some Aspects of Basic Research in the Chemical Sciences*, a review focused on the Department of Energy, has been prepared by the Committee on Chemical Sciences of the National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences. Copies are available without charge from: Office of Chemistry and Chemical Technology, National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Ave. Nw., Washington, DC 20418.

Robert M. White, former head of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, has been appointed executive officer of the National Academy of Sciences and administrator of the National Council. He succeeds William S. Coleman, who is retiring. White became chairman of the Academy's Climate Research Board after leaving NOAA in 1977. In his new post, he will sit atop the Research Council's \$50 million a year of mostly busywork, and will be directly responsible to Academy President Philip Handler.

•  
For those who wish to engage in scorekeeping on federal expenditures for research and development, two new publications provide a feast of data:

First, the National Science Foundation has issued a 5-page collection of "highlights" from the forthcoming edition of its annual series on *Federal Funds for Research and Development, Fiscal Years 1977-79*. The highlights version, plus detailed tables from the appendix of *Federal Funds*, are available without charge, by ordering as follows: NSF 79-300 and Appendix C of *Federal Funds* (Vol. XXVII); address: NSF, Science Resources Studies, 1800 G St. Nw., Washington, DC 20550.

The other publication is the *Intersociety Preliminary Analyses of R&D in the FY 1980 Budget*, a 126-page glut of numbers and commentary produced by a consortium of professional societies, with orchestration by the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The AAAS says that it has a limited number of copies; no charge. Address: Don Phillips, AAAS, Public Sector Program, 1776 Mass. Ave. Nw., Washington, DC 20036.

---

Science & Government Report  
Northwest Station  
Box 6226A  
Washington, D.C. 20015

---

Second class postage paid  
at Washington, D.C.

---

-00006 99/99  
XEROX UNIV MICROFILMS  
300 N ZEEB RD  
ANN ARBOR MI 48106



